DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 982 CG 003 168

By- Berzon, Betty; And Others

Peer: Planned Experiences for Effective Relating. An Audio Tape Program for Self-Directed Small Groups.

American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 1 Sep 68

Note- 37p.; Symposium at American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, August 30 through September 3, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95

Descriptors- Conflict Resolution, Group Dynamics, Interpersonal Relationship, *Personal Growth, Problem Solving, Programed Materials, *Self Actualization, *Self Directed Groups, *Sensitivity Training

Planned Experiences for Effective Relating (PEER), a 10-session audio-tape program for self-directed personal growth groups, was tested with two experimental populations, county labor camp inmates and university students. There were approximately eight persons in each group. Participants conducted their own sessions, using the PEER Program tapes for guidelines. The results indicate that subjects who participated in PEER groups experienced a position change in their self-concepts, while control subjects showed no change in their self-concepts over the same period. The PEER group experience appeared not to affect participants' sense of personal efficacy, nor were there changes on this measure for the control subjects. The findings indicate that self-directed groups, using carefully planned program materials, can be effective in promoting personal and organizational growth. (Author/KP)

PEER: PLANNED EXPERIENCES FOR EFFECTIVE RELATING

An Audio Tape Program for Self-Directed Small Groups[1]

Betty Berzon, Jerome Reisel, David P. Davis

Western Behavioral Sciences Institute
La Jolla, California

Presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, 1968.

This paper reports on the third and final year of a research project that has resulted in the development of PEER (Planned Experiences for Effective Relating), a program of pre-recorded audio tape-recordings. The PEER Program is the outcome of a seven year research effort on self-directed small groups: four years studying them (Berzon & Solomon, 1964; Berzon, 1964) and three years developing stimulus materials for their use (Solomon, Berzon & Weedman, 1965; Berzon, Soloman & Davis, 1966).[2]

In recent years, there has been increasing experimentation with ways to structure small group interaction in order to accelerate the learning process for participants.

The authors have selected, for mention, a few examples of these efforts.

Berlin (1965) and his associates at the Human Development Institute in Atlanta, Georgia have developed programmed instruction booklets for group members to use in conjunction with management training programs.

ED024982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SE 003 168

Schutz has devised techniques for general use in personal growth groups and for particular use in encounter microlabs. These techniques, along with their rationale, are described in his book, Joy: Expanding Human Awareness (1967).

Otto (1966; 1967a; 1967b), Shapiro (1966), Shostrom (1967), Malamud (1965), have all developed systematic approaches to structuring interaction in small groups. Gerard (1967) reports successful use of the psychosynthesis approach (1963) with small groups.

Rothaus (1966) and others, have done a considerable amount of research on the use of feedback instruments as a means of enhancing the learning process in autonomous groups.

Procedure

Development of the PEER Program[3]

For the Program developed in the first year of this project a cognitive learning model was used, (Solomon, Berzon, & Weedman, 1965). Research findings at the end of that year suggested a shift in the direction of the more experiential model used in the second year Program. (Berzon, Solomon, & Davis, 1966). In the third and current year, additional changes were made in the underlying philosophy, format, and content of the Program. Chief among them was the decision to increase the experiential emphasis of the Program. The use of audio tape-recordings for presentation of the material remained the same.

ED024982

It has been the experience of the authors that participants in personal growth groups tend to organize their experience spontaneously in the cognitive terms that are most meaningful for them. This process has been explored and discussed in some detail by Stock and Whitman (1967).

In developing PEER, the working hypothesis was that if the sessions could enable a sufficiently involving and relevant personal experience, the participants would provide the cognitive structure on their own. In order to accomplish this degree of involvement, effort was made to search out and devise exercises with high payoff levels for interpersonal learning.[4]

These exercises were designed to bring group members into confrontation with one another and to generate the flow of data among them. The exercises, or focused activities, included non-verbal expression, metaphorical language, compressed time microlabs, and symbolic enactment of issues central to group process and individual growth.

A second important change was the Program's orientation toward growth motivation and away from concern with participants' deficiencies. Attention was shifted so that it was not so much on problems, as on problem-solving, not so much on conflict, as on conflict resolution, not so much on inadequacies, as on counterbalancing strengths. In short, the focus was on what was enhancing and creative in the participant, rather than what was limiting and constricting.

Third, the new Program reflected an increased trust in the participants' ability to be self-directing. Much less structure was imposed

through the exercises and much more freedom was offered for the participant to determine his own degree of involvement. The authors knew from past experience with many of the techniques used in the PEER Program that they had considerable emotional impact. Consequently, it was thought particularly important that the participant have an opportunity to opt out of specific activities in a way that would not incur punishment from the group. Effort was made to provide this opportunity by making the goal and activity of each exercise explicit at the beginning of each session. In this way group members were given a chance to <u>privately</u> decide at what level they wished to be involved in a given exercise.

Fourth, the goals of the Program were restated, as follows, to reflect the changes described above.

The general purpose of PEER is to help people learn to relate more fully and effectively to the world around them. To accomplish this, PEER provides a series of structured opportunities for each participant to

a) express more easily his genuine feelings and receive the genuine feelings of others,

b) inquire more actively into his own experience,

c) try new behaviors in the group,

thereby, enabling the individual to increase his awareness of the choices available to him, understand better how he functions in groups, and gain more control over what happens between him and other people.[5]

To make the best use of the resources participants bring with them, PEER emphasizes:

a) personal strengths, rather than weaknesses, and potentialities rather than deficiencies;

b) learning through experience, the immediate, shared experience of the group, to which all members make meaningful contribution;

c) self-direction, in that the group can conduct its own sessions using the PEER guidelines, thereby making it unnecessary to have a professional leader.

In other words, PEER's orientation is positive, experiential, and self-directing.

Important changes were also made in format. The Program was changed from eighteen sessions to a shorter, more intensive ten sessions. In the present study, groups met for two two-hour sessions a day for five consecutive days. Alternative schedules would have been possible, such as the following:

a) a two and one-half day workshop with 4 sessions a day,

b) two week-end workshops of 5 sessions each,

c) ten consecutive days with 1 session a day,

d) five weeks with 2 sessions a week,

e) ten weeks with 1 session a week.

More use was made of examples to illustrate points made in the instructions for the exercises. Specially prepared taped segments from

other groups were used, as well as some dramatized material.

The extra paraphernelia of the 1966 Program were dispensed with: the feedback charts, the timer, etc. This was done in an effort to promote interpersonal confrontation as the main vehicle for communication and learning.

Also, the sequencing of sessions was changed. In the previous design the deeply involving personal experiences came later in the Program and were led up to gradually. In the present design they came at the beginning, for three reasons:

a) to capture the participants' interest;

b) to involve the group members with each other; and

c) to say to the participants that this will be different from any other group you've ever been in, and this is how.

The last was particularly important since it provided another opportunity to opt out for those individuals who would rather not involve themselves in situations in which they might become deeply stirred.

Additional changes were made in the content of the Program.

In the previous year, the exercises had stressed those aspects of personal and social functioning closely related to employability. In line with the currently broadening definition of what constitutes

vocational disability, the authors decided to use a less goal-oriented approach in the content of PEER. This was done in an attempt to provide a higher pay-off in terms of a learning experience for participants whose vocational problems have a broader social and/or emotional base, and to give the Program wider applicability.

An Outline of the PEER Program and description of the exercises appears in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Exercises[6]

Session 1 - First Encounter Microlab

This session utilizes the concept of the compressed-time microlab, in which there are a series of short, timed meetings and a variety of activities designed to bring the participants into confrontation with one another. Activities include:

Impressions - in which group members stand in a circle and, one at a time, each individual goes around the circle, stopping in front of each person. The instruction is to touch the person to make contact; look directly at him; and tell him your impression of him.

Break-In - in which the group members stand in a circle and one at a time each individual steps outside the circle and has to break-in in some way -- to become part of the in-group. The

other group members are instructed to keep the person from breaking-in.

Rolling - in which the group members stand in a circle and one at a time each individual goes to the center of the circle, relaxes as completely as he can and allows himself to be passed around by the other group members --- literally putting himself in their hands.

At the beginning of each of these activities, the narrator, on the tape, relates the activity to a personal growth issue, such as honesty, affiliation, trust, etc.

After each of these activities, a timed discussion period is provided in which participants are encouraged to discuss their feelings about what they just did.

Session 2 - Ground Rule

A ground rule is presented emphasizing the importance of expressing feelings, and of learning from the immediate, shared, "here and now" experience of the group. The rule is: a) to tune in to what is happening inside yourself and in the group, and b) to talk up about it. Examples of tuned-in and tuned-out groups are presented on the tape. Group members pair off to practice this kind of tuned-in interaction, then later reassemble as a total group to discuss what has happened.

Session 3 - Feedback

Information is presented regarding the importance of giving and receiving feedback in the group. Definitions of facilitative and non-facilitative feedback are given, and examples are given on the tape. Group members then practice giving and receiving facilitative feedback in a go around exercise.

Session 4 - Progress Report

Concepts presented in the three previous sessions are reviewed on the tape, and group members are asked to report to themselves on how they are doing relative to the ground rule, giving and using feedback, etc.

Session 5 - Secret Pooling

Group members are asked to write a personal secret anonymously. The papers are scrambled, and each person then reads the secret he pulled from the pool. The instruction is to read the secret aloud and tell how you think it would feel to have a secret like that. To insure anonymity, paper and pencils of uniform nature are provided.

Session 6 - Break-Out

Group members stand in a circle and one at a time each individual goes into the center of the circle. He is asked to deal with the circle of people as a problem that stands between him and his freedom. The instruction to the person in the center is to break-out of the circle. The instruction to the other group members is to do everything they

can to keep the person in the circle. Following the exercise, group members discuss what has happened and how they felt about it.

Session 7 - Descriptions

Participants are asked to go around, one at a time, and describe the other group members metaphorically --- as an animal, a piece of furniture, a car, etc. They are asked to tell everything they can about what they are describing, including how they feel about it. Examples of this kind of metaphorical description are given on the tape.

Session 8 - Strength Bombardment

Each group member takes a turn in which he spends: a) three minutes telling of his strengths and b) five minutes listening to the other group members tell him what they see about him that is good and strong.

Session 9 - Giving and Receiving

Participants are asked to select three people who have had the most trouble letting the other group members get close to them. These three people then go, one at a time, to the center of the circle. The other group members go, one at a time, to the person in the center and non-verbally express the positive feelings they have toward him. The person in the center is instructed to receive this expression without returning it -- to have an undiluted experience of receiving, without giving back.

After the three people, and anyone else who wishes to, have taken their turn, the group members discuss what has happened and how they feel about it.

Session 10 - Last Encounter Microlab

This session again involves a series of timed meetings, with varied activities. As in Session 1, the group members do Impressions and Rolling, each of which is followed by a discussion of what happened and how people felt about it. Opportunity is provided for participants to focus on how group members have changed in the PEER group. It is then suggested that they use the rest of the session to take care of unfinished business and to say good-bye to each other.

Experimental Design

In the present study there was an important shift in emphasis away from evaluating the self-directed programmed approach per se, since it was thought that the feasibility of the approach had been adequately demonstrated by previous studies (Berzon and Solomon, 1964; Berzon, 1964; Solomon, Berzon, et. al., 1965; Berzon, Solomon; et. al., 1966). Emphasis in this third and final year of the project was on refinement of the program content, format and presentation, as described in the section on development of the PEER Program. Research instrumentation, therefore, was drastically reduced from that of the first and second years of this project.

Two conditions were compared: one experimental and one control.

The experimental condition was self-directed groups, meeting without a professionally-trained leader present, using the PEER Program to guide their interaction. There were eight experimental groups of approximately eight persons each and they met in two different settings, each oriented toward personal growth: a) a county honor camp with a strong treatment focus, and b) a university YMCA. Three of the groups were composed of honor camp inmates (n = 28), and five of university students (n = 47).

The control condition was no group experience. Control Ss were comparable individuals from the same two subject populations described above. Pre- and post-tests were administered to them concurrent with data collection on the experimental Ss. There were 44 control Ss in all, 25 honor camp inmates and 19 university students.

Subjects

In the honor camp setting, subjects were male inmates of Barrett Honor Camp in San Diego County,[7] who volunteered to participate in response to an announcement made generally to the inmate population by the camp staff. Ss were law offenders who had committed misdemeanors, or were serving the confinement part of their probation for felonies.

In the university setting, subjects were male and female students at the University of California, Berkeley, who volunteered to participate in a project being sponsored by the campus YMCA, Stiles Hall.[8]

Criteria for inclusion in the study were the same as those used in the previous year: a) emotional adjustment (no chronic or acute psychosis); b) intelligence in the normal range; c) age range (between 18 and 60); d) ability to communicate (must be able to speak English, with no hearing or speech impairment of sufficient magnitude to seriously hinder communication in a small group); and e) motivation (reasonable assurance that the person would complete the group program).

In the honor camp, Ss signed up through camp staff members who were asked to be sure that all prospective group members complied with the criteria.

For the university population, assumption was made that anyone who was a matriculating student at the university level was of at least normal intelligence, would fall within or close enough to the prescribed age range, and would be able to communicate adequately in English.

Prior to the beginning of the university PEER groups, a general orientation meeting was conducted for all prospective group members by the senior author. At this time it was explained that the PEER Program was not designed to provide psychotherapy for individuals having acute emotional problems, but rather that it was an educational

experience for persons functioning normally in their personal lives. Those attending were asked to apply this criteria to themselves and decide whether or not they should participate in a group. Accordingly, some of those present selected themselves out and advised the senior author, privately, after the meeting, that they were doing so.

Characteristics of the subjects in this study are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here

Experimental Groups

All groups met for two two-hour sessions each day for five consecutive days. In each of the two experimental settings, all groups met during the same five-day period.

Participant-Observers

There were no provisions in either of the experimental settings for observing groups, and the authors felt that it was important for further program development to have feedback on group members' responses to the exercises. Therefore, in each of the eight groups, one member was asked to be a participant-observer. This person kept a log and met with the authors after the Program was completed to report, in some detail, on the sessions. Prior to the first session, it was explained to the group that there would be a participant-observer,

this person was identified for each group, and his duties were described. It was also explained that he was not a leader, had no special training, had never heard the tapes, and was going to participate as just another member of the group.

Measurements

Two instruments were used to evaluate pre-post change in participants. They were:

Self-Concept Scale - The Self-Concept Rating Scale is composed of ten, seven-point semantic differential rating scales on which the subject rates the concept, The Way I See Myself. The scales are defined by polar-opposite adjectives, such as strong-weak, active-passive, and useful-useless (modified from Aiken, 1965).

Personal Efficacy Scale - The Personal Efficacy Scale (Guerin, 1967) is a five item forced-choice instrument, designed to assess the individual's sense of efficacy.

Sample item:

1. CHECK ONE

_____ When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

_____ It is not always a good idea to plan too far ahead, because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyway.

Attendance and Attrition

Attendance and drop-out records were kept for both experimental populations in order to compare results with the 1965 and 1966 studies in this project.

Results[9]

Separate analyses were made of the Barrett Honor Camp and Berkeley student group data.

Barrett Honor Camp.

Self-Concept Rating Scale - T-tests made to analyze pre-post-follow-up changes for the experimental and control conditions, showed a significant ($p. < .05$) positive increase in self-concept for the experimental subjects from the pre-and/or post-measure to the three week follow-up measure. No significant changes were shown for the control subjects. (See Table 3).

Personal Efficacy Scale - A chi-square analysis was made on the pre-to-post change in personal efficacy for experimental and control conditions. No significant changes were found. When both pre-and post-findings were compared to follow-up data, no significant changes were found. (See Table 3).

Insert Table 3 here

Berkeley Student Groups

Self-Concept Scale - T-tests made to analyze pre-post changes for the experimental and control conditions showed a significant ($p. < .01$) positive increase in self-concept for the experimental subjects from pre-to-post. No significant changes were shown for the control subjects. (See Table 4).

It was not possible to obtain follow-up data on the Berkeley subjects because they were a transient summer session population, and the session ended immediately after completion of the PEER groups.

Personal Efficacy Scale - A chi-square analysis was made on the pre-to-post change in personal efficacy for experimental and control conditions. No significant changes were found. (See Table 4).

Insert Table 4 here

Attendance and Attrition

Results for self-directed groups in 1965, 1966, and 1967 are summarized in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 here

Discussion

Two kinds of data were used to assess the effectiveness of the PEER Program; a) quantitative data provided by the research instruments,

and b) qualitative data provided by personal reports of participants.

The quantitative data yields outcome information and the qualitative data yields evaluative information about the Program format and content.

The quantitative data indicates that a) subjects who went through PEER groups experienced positive change in their self-concept, while (no group) control subjects did not; b) those subjects who went through PEER groups did not experience change in their feelings of personal efficacy, nor did (no group) control subjects, and c) attendance and attrition rates in the self-directed groups in this study tended to be more favorable than those rates in the 1965 and 1966 studies.

As in previous years (Solomon, Berzon & Weedman, 1965; Berzon, Solomon & Davis, 1966) the self-concept does appear to be positively affected by the self-directed group program approach to personal growth.

An interesting issue is raised by the fact that the Berkeley students show significant positive change in self-concept at the completion of the one week group experience, while the honor camp inmates do not show change then, but do show it three weeks later.

These results suggest the possibility of a "rate of response" difference in the two populations. Contact with both populations

made it quite evident that there were broad differences between them in intellectual level, in socio-economic background, and in motivation for personal growth.

As compared to the honor camp inmates, the Berkeley students appeared to be more intelligent, of more advantaged socio-economic background, and more eager to make the best use they could of the learning opportunity that PEER presented them.

These differences would seem sufficient to explain the faster self-concept change in the Berkeley students. Probably, PEER enables more change at a faster rate in educated, middle-class, motivated persons for several reasons. Its goals are in line with their own growth-oriented values. Its content is more relevant to the needs of persons whose attention is focused on becoming more emotionally fulfilled, self-aware, and interpersonally competent, than on economic survival.

When evaluation of the effectiveness of PEER is being made with lower socio-economic groupings, the possibility of a slower "rate of response" should be taken into account. Further research on this issue would seem worthwhile.

Unlike self-concept change, the individual's sense of personal efficacy does not seem to be affected by the PEER experience. In a personal communication with Guerin (1967b), author of the Personal

Efficacy Scale, regarding results in the present study, he advised that his own research with the Scale suggests now that it is better used to predict job success after training than to measure pre-to-post training changes.

In view of Guerin's findings, and the results of the present study, the Personal Efficacy Scale would appear to have been an unfortunate choice as one of the only two instruments to evaluate the effectiveness of the PEER Program used over a period of five days.

With regard to attendance and attrition results, the tendency of the subjects in the 1967 study to miss fewer sessions and drop-out less than in previous years might be taken as an indication of the increased involvement generated by the PEER Program. However, several other factors must be considered. Changes from previous years were made not only in program format and content, but in the time periods involved and the subjects populations used.

In 1965 the time period involved was nine weeks. In 1966 it was nine days. In 1967 it was five days.

In 1965 and 1966 subjects were vocational rehabilitation clients being served by a state agency. In 1967 the honor camp inmates were comparable to the rehabilitation clients, but there was some limitation on the inmates' freedom to miss sessions or drop-out of groups. The Berkeley students, as has been discussed above, probably were more

highly motivated to make use of the group experience than the rehabilitation clients had been. Again, further research on these issues is indicated before conclusions can be drawn.

The qualitative data were obtained from the participant-observers' reports and the group interviews held with participants after completion of the PEER Program.

According to their reports, participants found the Program to be an effective unifying and focusing instrument in the groups. Presentation and format were favorably received. The emphasis on strengths and on activity as a data base were also favorably received.

It appeared from Ss' reports that an unusual degree of group cohesion was attained very early in the sessions and this is probably due to the physical contact involved in Session One, which would tend to decrease the psychological distance among participants sooner than might happen without such activity. Ss also reported a deeper involvement with one another than has been reported in the previous self-directed group studies in this project.

There also appeared to be adequate personal freedom provided the participants since, in many instances, they were able to modify the instructions so they were more suitable to their needs of the moment, or to ignore them altogether. As one of the Berkeley group members put it, "We discovered that we could turn off the tape-recorder,

that 'The Voice' was not inviolable. Once we did that, we felt we could do it anytime and we were freer to hear what 'The Voice' had to say."

As would be predicted, the physical contact was much more acceptable in the co-educational student group than it was in the all male inmate groups. However, the inmates reported that their discomfort with the physical contact evoked much discussion about men living in close and continuous proximity to other men. Their feeling was that such discussion was helpful and that it would never have occurred if they hadn't been confronted with the PEER exercises.

In particular, the activities that participants liked best were those involving use of "feedback" in any form. This is in line with findings of the two previous years in which those sessions featuring "feedback" were most highly valued both in self-reports and in process ratings.

Critical comments from participants resulted in specific changes in the PEER Program design. The majority of the participants found the sessions to be too long and they have subsequently been changed from two hours to one and a half hours.

The last session was thought to have too much structure for a group that has been together 13 1/2 hours. Revisions have been made

so that it is now a much freer session.

It was generally agreed that a second "go-around" in the "Secret Pooling" session would be productive and that has since been included in the instructions.

Summary and Conclusions

PEER, a ten session audio tape program for self-directed personal growth groups was tested with two experimental populations. Three groups of county honor camp inmates and five groups of university students met for two hour sessions, twice a day over five consecutive days. There were approximately eight persons in each group. Participants conducted their own sessions, using the PEER Program tapes for guidelines.

Results indicate that the Ss who went through PEER groups experienced a positive change in their self-concept while (no group) control subjects showed no change in their self-concept over the same period. The PEER group experience appeared not to affect participants' sense of personal efficacy, nor were there changes on this measure for the control Ss. Group members' personal reports suggest that the PEER Program does provide a meaningful, involving learning experience.

Findings in the present study and those which preceded it, in 1965 and 1966, lead the authors to conclude that self-directed groups, using carefully planned program materials, can be an effective means of

personal growth for the individuals who participate in them.

The authors see PEER being used for a variety of purposes:

a) as a means of increasing personal effectiveness for the individual group member,

b) as a training device to enable people to use their membership in groups more effectively,

c) as a means of learning through experience about group processes for potential group leaders,

d) as a way of providing both an experiential and a conceptual basis for a long-term self-directed group that will continue beyond the ten sessions,

e) as a means of identifying indigenous leadership in community health, education, welfare and social action programs.

Depending upon the specific needs of a given situation, PEER will undoubtedly be employed in other ways to bring about personal and organizational growth.

For the future, there seems particular promise in the development of custom programs. For instance, there might be a program written specially for children, or for families, or for parties to a negotiation--labor, foreign power, or civil rights. Programs could be developed for any group of people who have a special problem or concern in common.

With sufficient interfacing of such programs, it is conceivable that social systems might begin to evolve that would enhance the creative growth of individuals rather than inhibiting it. That is a goal that seems worthy of a very special continuing effort.

References

Aiken, E. G. Alternate forms of a semantic differential for measurement of changes in self-description. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 177-178.

Berlin, J. I. Management improvement program. Atlanta, Georgia: Human Development Institute, 1965.

Berzon, B. The self-directed therapeutic group: An evaluative study. La Jolla, Calif.: Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, 1964. Also, paper read at American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calif., 1964.

Berzon, B., & Solomon, L. N. The self-directed therapeutic group: An exploratory study. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 14, 366-369.

Berzon, B., Solomon, L. N., & Davis, D. P. A personal growth program for self-directed groups. La Jolla, Calif.: Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, 1966. Paper read at American Psychological Association meetings, New York, 1966. Submitted for publication.

Gerard, R. Symbolic visualization--a method of psychosynthesis. Topical Problems in Psychotherapy, 4, 1963, 70-80.

Gerard, R. Personal communication. 1967.

Guerin, G. JOBS Project Report. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. 1967a.

Guerin, G. Personal communication. 1967b.

Malamud, D. I., & Machover, S. Toward self-understanding: Group techniques self-confrontation. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1965.

Otto, H. A. Explorations in human potentialities. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1966.

Otto, H. A. Guide to developing your potential. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967a.

Otto, H. A. Methods designed to tap human potential: A handbook. Chicago, Ill.: Stone-Brandel Center, 1967b.

Rothaus, P., Johnson, D. L., et. al. Participation and sociometry in autonomous and trainer-led patient groups. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, No. 1, 68-76.

Schutz, W. C. Joy: Expanding human awareness. New York, Grove Press, 1967.

Shapiro, S. B. The selves inside you: An interview with Stewart Shapiro. Explorations, 1966, No. 6, 3-21.

Shostrom, E. L. Manual for self-actualization workshop. Santa Ana, Calif.: Institute of Therapeutic Psychology, 1967, 24-33.

Solomon, L. N., Berzon, B. & Weedman, C. W. The programmed group: a new rehabilitation resource. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Chicago, 1965. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy. In press.

Stock, D., & Whitman, R. M. Patients' and therapist's apperceptions of an episode in group therapy. Human Relations, 1957, X, No. 4, 367-383.

Footnotes

[1] The PEER Program was written by Betty Berzon and Jerome Reisel. The authors are especially indebted to Robert F. Gray, whose editing of the narrative made it more understandable.

[2] This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. RD 1748 from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

[3] The authors want to express special gratitude to those who consulted with us on the preparation of the PEER Program: Dr. Carl R. Rogers, Dr. William C. Schutz, Dr. Irving Janis, and Dr. Arnold R. Beisser.

[4] Grateful acknowledgement is made to all the people who went through PEER Exercises in the early stage of the Program's development and who gave us the benefit of their ideas for improving the sessions.

[5] The PEER goals are based on those defined by Warren G. Bennis in "Goals and Meta-Goals of Laboratory Training." NTL Human Relations Training News, Vol. 6, Pp. 1-4, No. 3, 1962.

[6] The exercises in the PEER Program are based upon experimental work done over the last decade by a number of people associated with personal growth learning in small groups. Dr. William C. Schutz

contributed to PEER in actual exercises (Impressions and Giving and Receiving), in the synthesizing of previously developed techniques (Break-In, Rolling, Break-Out), and in ideas for program format and organization. The work of Joyce and John Weir and Hannah Weiner, with non-verbal techniques in small groups, influenced the design of several exercises in PEER. The Secret Pooling exercise was designed by Dr. Gerald Goodman. The Strength Bombardment exercise was designed by Dr. Herbert Otto.

[7]The authors are grateful to the staff of the San Diego County Honor Camps, and to the staff of Barrett Honor Camps in particular, for their assistance in data collection.

[8] The authors would also like to acknowledge the assistance of Roger Egeberg and the staff of Stiles Hall in Berkeley, California in the collection of those data.

[9] Data analysis was performed by David P. Davis.

Table I

PEER Program Outline

Sequence	Session No.	Session Goals
I. Group Building	1	Effect personal involvement in the group.
	2	Orient to group process.
	3	Orient to facilitative feedback.
	4	Concept review and reinforce group norms.
II. Data Flow and Feeling Intensification	5	Generate interpersonal trust.
	6	Identify coping styles.
	7	Deepen interpersonal participation in the group.
	8	Focus on growth motivation.
	9	Re-inforce growth motivation.
III. Separation	10	Recognize behavior change and bind off separation process.

Table 2

1967 Project

Characteristics of Subjects*

		Barrett Honor Camp Subjects				Berkeley Student Subjects			
		Experimental (N=28)		Control (N=25)		Experimental (N=47)		Control (N=19)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sex:	male	28	100	25	100	22	47	11	58
	female	0	0	0	0	25	53	8	42
Age:	18-20	10	36	2	8	7	15	5	26
	21-30	5	18	4	16	38	81	10	53
	31-40	6	21	3	12	2	4	4	21
	41-50	4	14	15	60	0	0	0	0
	51-60	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61+	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
Marital Status									
	married	11	40	14	56	6	13	4	21
	divorced	6	20	5	20	1	2	0	0
	single	11	40	6	24	39	83	15	79
	widowed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	separated	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0

	Barrett Honor Camp Subjects				Berkeley Student Subjects			
	Experimental (N=28)		Control (N=25)		Experimental (N=47)		Control (N=19)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Education								
H.S.grad or less	26	93	22	88	2	4	0	0
2 yrs. coll.or less	2	7	3	12	4	8	2	11
2 or more yrs.coll.	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	57
college grad.	0	0	0	0	24	52	4	21
advanced degree	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	11
Occupations								
professionals	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0
managers/proprietors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
salesworkers	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
housewives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
students	3	11	0	0	47	100	19	100
office workers	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0
restaurant workers	3	11	3	12	0	0	0	0
skilled workers	12	42	6	24	0	0	0	0
domestic workers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Barrett Honor Camp Subjects				Berkeley Student Subjects			
	Experimental (N=28)		Control (N=25)		Experimental (N=47)		Control (N=19)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
hospital workers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unskilled laborers	8	28	13	52	0	0	0	0
none	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Includes dropouts. (See Table 5 for drop-out information).

Table 3

Barrett Honor Camp Results

Mean Scale Scores*

	Experimental Subjects			Control Subjects		
	Pre	Post	Follow-up	Pre	Post	Follow-up
Self-Concept**	53.2	52.6	56.7	50.0	51.0	50.6
	(n=22)	(n=22)	(n=15)	(n=22)	(n=22)	(n=17)
Personal	2.14	2.48	2.20	2.57	2.81	2.47
Efficacy***	(n=21)	(n=21)	(n=15)	(n=21)	(n=21)	(n=17)

* Mean scale scores were computed from the number of correctly completed research forms available (see n's).

** Maximum score possible is 70.0.

*** Maximum score possible is 5.00.

Table 4

Berkeley Students Results

Mean Scale Scores*

	Experimental Subjects		Control Subjects	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Self-Concept**	48.6	53.3	48.2	48.7
	(n=47)	(n=42)	(n=19)	(n=19
Personal	2.08	2.19	1.95	2.05
Efficacy***	(n=47)	(n=43)	(n=19)	(n=19)

* Mean scale scores were computed from the number of correctly completed research forms available (see n's).

** Maximum score possible is 70.0.

*** Maximum score possible is 5.00.

Table 5

Attendance and Attrition Rates for Self-Directed Groups in 1965, 1966, and 1967.

	1965	1966	1967	
			Honor Camp Inmates	Berkeley Students
Average percentage of membership absent each session:	16.5%	8.5%	6.1%	2.6%
Percentage of original membership dropped-out:	18.0%	12.0%	7.4%	6.2%